

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated January 31, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-33 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants traverse this rejection and submit that claim 33 includes limitations that a computer useable medium that causes a computer to provide interactive assistance with populating an automated document. The Applicants submit that such limitations meet the requirements of "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" published on the USPTO website on October 26, 2005 and rulings of *In re Beauregard*. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the rejection of claim 33 as non-statutory subject matter.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roper (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,351). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows.

Applicant's invention as set forth in claim 1 is directed to a method for providing interactive assistance with populating an automated document that includes at least one

field, the method including performing a compliance check of each response for the at least one field.

The invention, as claimed in claim 1, assists users with filling out, in full legal compliance, recurring sets of paperwork associated with their job that have embedded legal requirements. The invention builds artificial intelligence into the online paperwork in order to automatically support school staff in applying correctly and consistently all of the embedded procedural requirements, which alleviates training staff to remember all of the embedded requirements and to apply them correctly.

The Office Action asserts that Roper teaches performing a compliance check of each response for the at least one field, in column 8, lines 44-56. However, the cited section of Roper merely teaches that the system "provides" an option for the creation of forms that "may" be required prior to creating an individual education plan. In Roper, a user must determine on their own whether these additional forms are required, and the user must select the option to create the form. Although Roper states, in column 8, lines 52-56, that "the individual education program tracking system automatically generates the forms for complying with these regulatory requirements," Roper continues, in lines 57-64, to explain that the user must select the option of creating the form and further select which form to create among various options. Therefore, the only automatic generation of the form that Roper teaches is the generation of a printed form after information has been entered in the selected screen. Roper does not teach performing a compliance check of each response for the at least one field. Roper relies on a user to determine when referral/permission/assessment forms are a prerequisite.

Therefore, the Applicants submit that Roper does not disclose or suggest a method for providing interactive assistance with populating an automated document that includes at least one field, the method including at least performing a compliance check of each response for the at least one field, as recited in claim 1.

For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited prior art. For similar reasons, Applicants submit that claims 21, 22, and 33 are likewise allowable.

As claims 1 and 22 are allowable, Applicants submit that claims 2-20 and 23-32, which depend from allowable claims 1 and 22, are also allowable over the cited art for at least the above noted reason and for the additional features they provide.

### **Conclusion**

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge

any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to

Deposit Account No. 01-2300 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 026063-00014.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sheree Rowe". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Sheree" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Rowe".

Sheree T. Rowe  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 59,068

**Customer No. 004372**

1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036-5339

Telephone No. (202) 715-8492

Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810